

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 6-18 are pending in this application. Claims 12-18 have been withdrawn by the Examiner. Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 5. Claim 5 has been canceled. Claims 2 and 6 have been amended to only correct an informality.

Rejection of Claims on Formal Matters: 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner indicated that the specification fails to show that the reference part is “between” the first region, which is defined by the recess portions, and the forging die. (Office Action, page 3).

We have made claim amendments to claim 1 to address the Examiner’s rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claim 1, as amended, requires:

providing a reference part on the metal plate, the reference part securing a relative position between the first region on the metal plate and the forging die

Support for the claim amendments is found in the originally filed drawings in Figs. 11A and 11B. In particular, Fig. 11A shows the first region as 71 and the reference part as 73. In Fig. 11B, the reference pins 72 are inserted through the reference part 73 to secure the relative position between the first region 73 on the mother strip 55 and the forging die 68, thus allowing forging die 68 to accurately perform plastic working on the first region 73.

Furthermore, support for the claim amendments and compliance with the “written description requirement” is found in the originally filed Specification on page 7, lines 5-11, which disclose:

Preferably, the step of **providing the reference part includes a step of forming a through hole to which a reference pin provided in the forging die is to be inserted. According to the secure engagement between the reference pin and the through hole, the positioning accuracy can be enhanced.** Alternatively, a protrusion, a recess, a notch, a mark or the like may be adopted as the reference part in accordance with a mode of a reference member provided in the forging die. [emphasis added].

As well, support for the claim amendments and compliance with the “written description requirement” is found in the originally filed Specification on page 31, lines 11-21, which disclose:

In the forging machine 64, a slider 67 reciprocating in the vertical direction is equipped with plural male dies 68. Female dies 70 paired with the male dies 68 are disposed on a stationary table 69. In the forging machine 64, working stages S1, S2, S3, S4 and S5 are arranged in sequence from the left of Fig. 11B, and the male die 51 and the female die 52 shown in Figs. 8A through 9B are arranged at the working stage S4 or S5.

In order to determine the position of the mother strip 55 sequentially sent to the respective working stages S1 to S5 and **to set the relative position between a worked region 71 (see Fig. 11A) and the male die 68 or the female die 70,** reference pins 72 are erected on the female die 70. Although not explicitly shown, a pair of the reference pins 72 are arranged for each of the working stages S1 to S5, and each pair of the reference pins 72 are arranged on a line extending orthogonal to a sequential feed direction of the mother strip 55. Accordingly, a pair of reference holes 73 shown in Fig. 11A are provided at both sides of each of the worked regions 71 corresponding to the respective working stages. Incidentally, the section of the reference pin 72 is circular, and the

reference hole 73 is also circular. [emphasis added]

Indeed, no new matter has been added, and the claimed invention is described in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can reasonably conclude that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. Therefore, this rejection of claims 1-11 should be withdrawn.

Drawing Objections

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). The Examiner indicated that the drawings must show every features of the invention specified in the claims. The Examiner alleged the feature where the reference part is “between” the first region, which is defined by the recess portions, and the forging die must be shown or the feature cancelled from the claims. (Office Action, page 2).

This rejection has been fully addressed by the clarifying amendments made to claim 1 and the extensive explanation and support given above, referencing Figs. 11A and 11B of the originally filed drawings. Accordingly, this drawing objection should be withdrawn.

Prior Art Rejections: 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jeglinski (4,425,777) in view of Rooney (5,144,709). Applicant traverses the § 103 rejection.

Herein amended claim 1 requires:

wherein the step of providing the deformation absorber is performed before the step of performing the plastic working

The Examiner indicated that Jeglinski teaches the basic method of manufacturing liquid ejection head chambers and nozzles communicating with the chambers where the manufacturing

includes a forging die 2. (Office Action, page 3). Further, the Examiner indicated that Rooney teaches recess portions 85, in a first region, and deformation absorbers 66 and 72, in a second region. (Office Action, page 3.)

However, the combination of Jeglinski and Rooney fails to teach or suggest the step of providing the deformation absorber is performed before the step of performing the plastic working. Particularly, Rooney performs plastic working for circular aperture 50, *resulting in the alleged recess portion 85 in the first region*, before the deformation absorbers 66 and 72 are formed (Fig. 2). That is, Rooney clearly shows that the alleged deformation absorbers 66 and 72 are formed after the plastic working for forming the circular aperture 50 is performed, thus teaching away from subject matter of claim 1.

Since Rooney teaches away from the subject matter of claim 1 and Jeglinski fails to compensate for Rooney, the combined teachings of Jeglinski and Rooney cannot be said to render unpatentable claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-4 and 6-11 be withdrawn.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/644,088

Attorney Docket No. Q77070

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,




CHRISTOPHER LIPP 41,157

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

 Kelly G. Hyndman
Registration No. 39,234

Date: October 21, 2005